



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,445	12/27/2005	Francis Garnier	126375	3480
25944	7590	05/06/2009	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			PILLING, CHRISTOPHER D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3753			
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/06/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/562,445	GARNIER, FRANCIS	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	
	ROBIN O. EVANS	3753	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Pilling

(3) Richard Castellano (Reg.# 61961)

(2) Robin O. Evans

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 4/28/09.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant  
2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: C.

Identification of prior art discussed: Willis.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative to add limitations to claim 1 to include the pore shape, diameter and size range of the pores. Examiner stated that Willis appeared to teach most of those limitations in either 102 or 103 rejections. Examiner agreed that removing the word substantially from the shape limitation and stating the criticality or advantages of the narrower range may over come the prior art of record however a new search would also be done.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/CPI/

/Robin O. Evans/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3753